



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/627,009	07/27/2000	James J. Macor	3655-0137P	2699

7590 03/17/2004

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
P.O. BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22032-0747

EXAMINER

ALPHONSE, FRITZ

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2675

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/627,009

Applicant(s)

MACOR, JAMES J.

Examiner

Fritz Alphonse

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,11-20,22-25,31-41,49-55 and 59-68 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,3-7,11-17,19,20,22-25,31-40,49-55 and 59-68 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 18 and 41 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2675

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-4, 11-16, 19-20, 22-25, 34-39, 59-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler (U.S. Pat. No. 6,302,612) in view of Johnson (U.S. Pat. No. 5,889,602).

As to claim 1, Fowler (fig. 20) shows a computer monitor comprising: a primary display platform (131) having a display screen; at least one auxiliary display platform (148) having a display screen; and at least one hinge (147) rotatably connecting said at least one auxiliary display platform (148) to said primary display platform (131), such that said at least one auxiliary display platform can be operated at a variety of angles relative to said primary display platform, to suit the ergonomic preferences of a user (see col. 5, lines 14-20).

Fowler does not teach about a display platform optically connected to a primary display platform through at least one hinge.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Johnson (figs. 1-2) shows a portable computer system (10), wherein an optical hinge (17) is being used for connecting a display (26) to a platform (14). See col. 1, line 66 through col. 2, line 32).

Art Unit: 2675

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Johnson's optical image with Fowler's display device. Doing so would provide a high data rate communication path with low EMI, light weight and that can operate through a mechanical hinge of an electronic instrument.

As to claims 3-4, 22-23, Fowler (fig. 20) shows a computer monitor, wherein at least one auxiliary display platform (148) is sized and shaped to cover at least a portion of said display screen of said primary display platform in a closed position; and wherein the auxiliary display platform to cover all of the display screen of the primary display platform in said closed position (see fig. 11).

As to claims 11 and 34 Fowler (fig. 2) shows a computer monitor, comprising an auxiliary display platform rotatably connected to a primary display platform with a horizontally-directed hinge (115).

As to claim 12 and 35 Fowler (fig. 2) shows a computer monitor, comprising a second auxiliary display platform rotatably connected to a primary display platform with a second horizontally-directed hinge.

As to claims 13, 19 and 24-25 and 36 Fowler (fig. 2) shows a computer monitor, wherein said first and second auxiliary display platforms (119, 120) are sized and shaped to cover at least a portion of said display screen of said primary display platform in a closed position; and wherein said primary display platform and said at least one auxiliary display platform are integrated to inhibit overlapping of any display images.

Art Unit: 2675

As to claims 14-16, 37-39 Fowler (fig. 2) shows a computer monitor, comprising an auxiliary display platform rotatably connected to a primary display platform with a vertically-directed hinge (116); and a second and third auxiliary display platform rotatably connected to a primary display platform with a second horizontally-directed hinge (115).

As to claim 20, the claim differs from claim 1 by the additional limitation "a computer system comprising: a processing unit". However, this limitation is disclosed by Fowler (note that the computer has a processor a base member or keyboard for processing data).

3. Claims 61-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler in view of Mizoguchi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,381,125).

As to claims 61 and 64 Fowler (fig. 20) shows a computer monitor comprising: a primary display platform (131) having a display screen; at least one auxiliary display platform (148) having a display screen; at least one hinge rotatably (147) connecting said at least one auxiliary display platform (148) to said primary display platform (131), such that said at least one auxiliary display platform can be operated at a variety of angles relative to said primary display platform, to suit the ergonomic preferences of a user (see col. 5, lines 14-20).

Fowler does not disclose a motor for selectively rotating at least one auxiliary display platform relative to a primary display platform between an open position and a closed position.

However, these limitations are clearly disclosed by Mizoguchi (col. 10, lines 34-38).
Mizoguchi.

Art Unit: 2675

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to improve upon the computer system, as disclosed by Mizoguchi's. Doing so would improve a personal computer provided with a flat panel display unit, so as to make the whole apparatus compact, to protect the display panel, and to easily operate the apparatus.

As to claim 62, Fowler (fig. 20) shows a computer monitor, wherein at least one auxiliary display platform (148) is sized and shaped to cover at least a portion of said display screen of said primary display platform in a closed position.

As to claims 63 and 66, the claims have substantially the limitations of claim 61; therefore, they are analyzed as previously discussed in claim 61 above.

As to claims 65, Fowler (fig. 2) shows a computer monitor, wherein said first and second auxiliary display platforms (119, 120) are sized and shaped to cover at least a portion of said display screen of said primary display platform in a closed position.

4. Claims 5-7, 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler in view of Johnson and further in view of Ohgami (U.S. Pat. No. 6,191,938).

As to claims 5 and 31, Fowler does not explicitly disclose one activation/deactivation mechanism for turning on and turning off the display screens of said display platforms.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Ohgami discloses an electronic apparatus comprising one activation/deactivation mechanism for turning on and turning off the display screens of said display platforms (see abstract).

Art Unit: 2675

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Fowler by specifically providing a mechanism for turning on and turning off the display screens, as disclosed by Ohgami (see the motivation above). The motivation would have been a desire to save power, thereby the cost of energy would be cut.

As to claims 6 and 32, Fowler does not explicitly teach about an activation/deactivation mechanism adapted for turning on the display screens through rotation of said at least one auxiliary display platform from the closed position to the opened position and turning off said display screens through rotation of said at least one auxiliary display platform from said opened position to said closed position. However, these limitations are disclosed by Ohgami (see abstract). See the motivation above

As to claims 7 and 33, the claims have substantially the limitations of claim 6. Therefore, they are analyzed as discussed in claim 7.

5. Claims 17, 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler in view of Johnson and further in view of Gouko (U.S. Pat. No. 6,222,507).

As to claims 17 and 40, Fowler does not teach about a fourth auxiliary display platform rotatably connected to a primary display platform with a second horizontally-directed hinge. However, this limitation is disclosed by Gouko (see figure 6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to improve upon the compact personal computer system, as disclosed by

Art Unit: 2675

Gouko. Doing so would improve the quality of image when a plurality of images are displayed in a divided areas is too small to be seen comfortably.

6. Claims 49-55, 67-68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler in view of Grewer (U.S. Pat. No. 5,926,165) and further in view of Robert Cowart (author of Mastering Windows TM 3.1/Special Edition).

As to claims 49 and 67, Fowler (fig. 20) shows a method for displaying images on a computer monitor having at least two rotatably connected display platforms (note the connected display platforms 147).

Fowler does not teach about a method comprising the steps of displaying a first image on one of said display platforms; selecting a second image for display from said first image; opening said selected second image on said other display platform.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Grewer (fig. 2) shows a method for displaying a first image (4) on one of display platforms (display 2); selecting a second image (32 or 33) for display from said first image (4); opening said selected second image (32 or 33) on said other display platform (note the opening 32a and 33a in display platform 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Fowler with the display device, as disclosed by Grewer. Doing so would provide a device which enable individual images or sub-groups of images or a part of an image to be selected simply and distinctly from a group of images, which may also

Art Unit: 2675

consist of one large image, and also enable a fast and distinct change over the other images or sub-groups of images or parts of an image.

In addition, Fowler does not disclose the step of sizing the opened second image in relation to the available display space on the other display platform to inhibit overlapping of the opened second image with other images being displayed on said other display platform.

However, this is obvious as evidenced by Robert Cowart. Robert Cowart teaches about tiling windows which provides a command for sizing an opened image in relation to the available display space on other display platform to inhibit overlapping of an opened second image with other images being displayed on other display platform (see Robert Cowart (author of Mastering WindowsTM 3.1/Special Edition) pages 66-67; page 657 and page 695)).

It would have been obvious to use a Tile Command, which sizing an opened second image in relation to the available display space on other display platform, as disclosed by Cowart. By doing so a user may find it is more convenient to keep track of images when many windows applications are running on a display screen.

As to claims 50-53, the claims have substantially the limitations of claim 49; therefore, they are analyzed as previously discussed in claim 49 above.

As to claim 68, Fowler (fig. 2) shows a computer monitor, wherein said first and second auxiliary display platforms (119, 120) are sized and shaped to cover at least a portion of said display screen of said primary display platform in a closed position.

Art Unit: 2675

As to claim 54-55, the claims have substantially the limitations of claim 49, therefore, they are analyzed as previously discussed in claim 49 above.

7. Claims 59 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fowler in view of Johnson and further in view of Mizoguchi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,381,125).

As to claims 59 and 60, Fowler does not explicitly disclose a motor for selectively rotating at least one auxiliary display platform relative to said primary display platform between an open position and a closed position. However, these limitations are clearly disclosed by Mizoguchi (col. 10, lines 34-38). See the motivation above.

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 18 and 41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO Form 892.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fritz Alphonse whose telephone number is (703) 308-8534.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Saras, can be reached at (703) 305-9720.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Art Unit: 2675

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding
should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone
number is (703) 306-0377.



F. Alphonse

Art Unit: 2675

February 27, 2002



STEVEN SARAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600